

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1-30 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants believe that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

### Regarding DETAIL ACTION

The present Office Action states on page 2, paragraph 3: "The cross references related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e., update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 13). Correction is required." Applicants respectfully submit that the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 11, of the specification has been amended herein to include the requested information along with the other amendments to the paragraph that were included within the Preliminary Amendment that was previously filed on February 24, 2003.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The present Office Action states on page 3, paragraph 4: "Claims 1, 4-11, 14-21, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** (US 6282551, filed 07/20/1998) in view of **Rajarajan et al.** (US 6950990, filed 12/11/2001)." However, Applicants respectfully point out that there is no discussion regarding Claim 21 within this rejection. As such, Applicants understand that Claims 1, 4-11, 14-20 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,551 (hereafter Anderson) in view of Rajarajan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,950,990 (hereafter Rajarajan). Claims 2, 3, 12, 13 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Rajarajan as applied to Claims 1 and 11, and further in view of Insenser Farre et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,460,172 (hereafter Insenser Farre).

CLAIMS 1, 4-11, 14-20 and 24-30

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 1 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A method for facilitating the display of information of a document for a selected pre-configured function, said method comprising:

receiving said selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks;

scanning said document corresponding to said selected pre-configured function for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document;

in response to said scanning, automatically rendering graphic elements for each corresponding indicator, wherein a graphic element is rendered with a descriptive label according to information within said indicator;

in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to said selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location; and

corresponding to said selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within said document, said scroll bar and said scroll box for scrolling through said document.

Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 1. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "receiving said selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks" as recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully point out that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, are silent with regard to a microcontroller. Additionally, Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to said selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location" as recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully point out that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, are silent with regard to the scrolling recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, since Anderson and Rajarajan, alone

or in combination, do not teach or suggest elements as recited in amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and is thus in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully point out that amended independent Claims 11 and 21 each include claim limitations similar to those discussed above with regard to amended independent Claim 1. As such, since Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest elements as recited in amended independent Claims 11 and 21, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 11 and 21 are thus in condition for allowance over Anderson and Rajarajan.

Applicants respectfully point out that since Claims 8, 18 and 28 depend from allowable amended independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively, Claims 8, 18 and 28 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "wherein said pre-configured function is selected from a catalog of pre-configured functions" as recited in amended Claims 8, 18 and 28. Therefore, since Anderson and Rajarajan, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest elements as recited in amended Claims 8, 18 and 28, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 8, 18 and 28 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 14-17, 19, 20, 24-27, 29 and 30, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 14-17, 19, 20, 24-27, 29 and 30 depend from allowable amended independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 14-17, 19, 20, 24-27, 29 and 30 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

### CLAIMS 21-23

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 21 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A computer-usable medium having computer-readable program code embodied therein for causing a computer system to perform a method for facilitating the display of information of a document for a selected pre-configured function, said method comprising:

receiving said selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks;

scanning said document corresponding to said selected pre-configured function for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document; and

in response to said scanning, automatically rendering graphic elements for each corresponding indicator, wherein a graphic element is rendered with a descriptive label according to information within said indicator; and

in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to a selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location.

Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 21. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "receiving said selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks" as recited in amended Claim 21. Applicants respectfully point out that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, are silent with regard to "a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks". Additionally, Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to a selected graphic element and displaying information of said predetermined location" as recited in amended Claim 21. Applicants respectfully point out that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, are

silent with regard to the scrolling recited in amended Claim 21. Therefore, since Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest elements as recited in amended independent Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 21 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and is thus in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 22-23 depend from allowable amended independent Claim 21 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 22-23 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in amended Claims 22 and 23.

#### CLAIMS 2, 3, 12 and 13

As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 11 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) that were based on Anderson and Rajarajan. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Insenser Farre does not remedy the shortcomings of Anderson and Rajarajan. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "receiving said selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks" as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully point out that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, are silent with regard to "a microcontroller comprises said plurality of programmable system blocks". It is noted that amended independent Claim 11 includes claim limitations similar to those recited above with regard to amended independent Claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1 and 11 are not rendered obvious by Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, and are thus in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 depend from allowable amended independent Claims 1 and 11 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and are thus in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Anderson, Rajarajan and Insenser Farre, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in amended Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13.

### CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that pending Claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and that action is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,  
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: DEC. 19, 2007



Thomas M. Catale  
Registration No.: 46,434

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060  
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069